

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on June 3, 2008.

Claims 1, 9, and 10 are amended, no claims are canceled, and claims 15-18 are added; as a result, claims 1-18 are now pending in this application. Applicant submits that claims 15-18 are fully supported by the originally-filed specification and contain no new matter.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Paul D'Agostino for the courtesy of a telephone interview on October 22, 2008 with Applicant's representative John I. Fischer where the independent claims were discussed. No agreement was reached with respect to the claim language in light of the cited references.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants submitted an Information Disclosure Statement and a 1449 Form on February 20, 2008. Applicants respectfully request that initialed copy of the 1449 Form be returned to Applicants' Representatives to indicate that the cited references have been considered by the Examiner.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by U.S. Patent 6,319,125 to Acres. Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, and 10 to further clarify the inventive subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that these amended claims overcome these rejections.

In particular, Applicant cannot find in the cited portions of Acres any disclosure or description of "identifying, using an association data structure, a first application queue associated with a first application configured to process the primary event message," as presently recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 8, 9, and 10. Acres does not route messages based on an association in an association data structure. As Acres states:

If the message is addressed to the particular bonus server 370 (block 393), the message is routed to the appropriate event manager (CSM 380, BCM 378 or MCM 376) (block 394). Otherwise, the message is ignored.

Acres at col. 32, lines 1-5. Apparently, in this example, Acres uses the message addressing to route the particular message. In other words, Acres appears to rely on address data in the message itself to route messages, it does not use a configurable association data structure that can use other factors besides a simple destination address to route messages to an appropriate application.

Furthermore, Applicant cannot find in the cited portions of Acres any disclosure or description of “the association data structure implemented using a relational database” as presently recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 8, 9, and 10. Instead, the Office Action refers to FIGS. 2A-2N of Acres and states that a “relational database implicitly disclosed wherein Figs. 2A-2N teach of ‘A configuration workstation 359 is used to monitor, configure and modify bonus parameters on the bonus server 351...’” Office Action at p. 4, lines 6-10 (citing Acres at col. 18, lines 14-18). Applicant has reviewed these cited portions of Acres and submits that these figures merely show representative user interfaces for a configuration workstation 359. Applicant does not concede that Acres’ FIGS. 2A-2N disclose a relational database. Even if, *arguendo*, the user interfaces in FIGS. 2A-2N of Acres do imply a relational database, they clearly do not provide the disclosure needed to anticipate “identifying, using an association data structure, a first application queue associated with a first application configured to process the primary event message,” as recited in claims 1, 8, 9 and 10.

Thus, because Acres does not disclose or describe all elements of claims 1, 8, 9, and 10, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration withdrawal of the § 102(b) basis of these rejections.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,319,125 to Acres in view of U.S. Patent 6,289,382 to Bowman-Amuah. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Dependent claims 12-14 depend from independent claim 10 either directly or indirectly, and accordingly incorporate the features of this independent claim. These dependent claims are accordingly believed to be patentable for at least the reasons stated herein regarding claim 10. For brevity, Applicant defers (but reserves the right to present) further remarks, such as concerning any dependent claims, which are believed separately patentable. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this basis of rejection for these claims.

Concerning new claims 15-18

Support for claims 15-18 can be found throughout the originally-filed specification. For example, support for claim 15 can be found at least on page 13, lines 8-10 and FIG. 6; claims 16-17 can be found at least on page 12, lines 7-21; and claim 18 can be found at least on page 14, lines 9-15 and FIG. 7. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 15-18 do not introduce any new matter. Claims 15-18 recite elements such as a central server and an association data structure implemented using a relational database, which as discussed above are not found in the cited references. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable over the current references and request notification of the same.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' representative at (612) 371-2134 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 371-2134

Date November 3, 2008

By 
John I. Fischer
Reg. No. 60,900

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 3 day of November, 2008.

Zhakalazky M. Carrion

Name

Signature

